

Tom Richardson ([00:02](#)):

Good morning, slightly brisk morning at this stage. My name is Tom Richardson. I'm a senior reporter within daily and Adelaide based independent news website, published by solstice media. Welcome to the 2016 Adelaide Festival of Ideas and today's session Athenian democracy. This session is proudly presented by the Australian center for social innovation of which I guess Nicholas grew in is the chat. Now, before we begin today, I would like to acknowledge that we are gathered on the traditional country of the Ghana people of the Adelaide plans. We recognize and respect their cultural heritage, beliefs, and relationships with the land. We acknowledge that these are of continuing importance to the garner people living today, and that we respect their elders past and present. Also, before we begin the traditional housekeeping rules, can I ask that you please switch your mobile phone to silent during the session, if you haven't done so already, but don't switch it off altogether because you are welcome to connect with the festival.

Tom Richardson ([01:01](#)):

The Twitter handle is at 80 L F R I and the hashtag is the same hashtag ADL FOI. If you're Instagram inclined, it's the same thing again at ADL FOI, hashtag ADL. Oh, I, I believe it. Oh no, that turn in front. If that wasn't clear, but don't get over exuberant about engaging with the festival because I don't wanna throw wise recordings of any kind of not permitted during this session. However, today's session is being audio recorded by radio Adelaide for broadcast and future podcasting. Now as a form of TV journal, perhaps an interesting choice to chair, a session that limits the influence of quote from the program, the political inquiry attainment complex degrading representative politics. But luckily you're not going to hear from me on that nor on wide bypassing. The combative vent of Vox politics could lead to a democratic rebirth. So without further ado to our guest, Nicholas growing as an economist, entrepreneur and commentator on our economy society and on innovation, he has chaired innovation Australia and the federal government 2.0 task force.

Tom Richardson ([02:04](#)):

He has worked as a policy advisor to the former Hawkin Caden governments, and was that people who were pine it of the button plan for now light lamented Australian car industry, as a stint after, after a stint at the productivity commission, he joined the business council of Australia before in 2000 forming his consultancy lateral economics of which he's CEO. He was also the inaugural chairman of Melbourne based data analytics company. Kagggle he's continued to advise various federal and state governments as a consultant and as a member or chair of various boards and committees, including sustainability Victoria. He's a member of the council of the national library of Australia, irregular and respected newspaper columnist and blogger, and has held visiting fellowships at the university of Melbourne, the Australian national university. And he's adjunct professor of the university of technology Sydney, please welcome Nicholas Bruin.

Nicholas Bruin ([03:02](#)):

How'd they rush away from my slots to assemble themselves. So picture yourself in 2009 you're an American citizen and you have a new exciting black president and the world is tumbling into the largest financial crisis since the great depression. Your president says that he wants your views and you're welcome to write them on a website. And the most popular views will be promoted up the ladder and we will find out what the solutions of the people are that was Don in I think May, 2009. What do you think was the most important thing that the people of the United States who participated in this

exercise thought should do? Yes. Okay. Not, not quite there. I'm going to show you the top three and jobs certainly in the first one.

Nicholas Bruin ([04:15](#)):

Okay. So what they really wanted in the exercise was to legalize marijuana. Number two. Yes. Well, that's good. And there's no reason why that's not necessarily the there's no reason why that well, I think it's the wrong answer to the question. What's the most important thing, but I'm not suggesting it's a bad policy. In fact, I might have something, he decided that that that'd be lighter. So number two, of course is a more important subject even. So I think that got the order wrong. That was number two and number three, spoke to him very particular American problem. And as you know, Americans have a little more trouble than most of us with being abducted by aliens. And so if you add up all the different differently expressed requests that relate to aliens, including release the Roswell's files that comes third.

Nicholas Bruin ([05:26](#)):

So ladies and gentlemen welcome to box pop democracy and the simplest way, know what I mean? I think by that, but the simplest way to explain what Fox puck democracy is, is that it is fi asking what people think before they've had time to think, or perhaps in the example that I've just given you before they've given themselves time to think. So it's now got pretty be serious. I think most of us might agree with our person who will probably lose the presidential election, but we'll get more than 40% of the votes of responsible, decent Americans. And we'll and, and get that close to having his to having the nuclear codes, a person who unlike some of the others candidates thrown up in the sort of morphing freak show that American politics has been for a couple of decades, simply knows nothing about what he's talking about and, and demonstrates that quite viscerally and makes it pretty clear that the emotion is the message if you like.

Nicholas Bruin ([06:56](#)):

And there's Nigel Farrage and the remarkable vote on Brexit where people express themselves surely enough. But the most common Google search the day after was what is the you so I want to suggest to you that in fact, just as Australia neoliberal reform in the Hawke Keating governments and did it better than Margaret Thatcher and and Ronald Reagan that we led the world in this phenomenon rather more subtly, if you like, or rather more properly than the other two, these other two English speaking countries did, but ponder this, that the most important the most important legislative achievement of the law parliament was to re replace carbon pricing, which raised about two, which would be now raising about \$10 billion a year, about a third of the deficit, replacing it with a carbon subsidy to polluters, to encourage them to pollute less.

Nicholas Bruin ([08:22](#)):

And had you had there been a free on publicity, on structured vote in the parliament if you just found out the views of parliamentarians about 75, 85, 90% of parliamentarians would have said that was a stupid idea, which it is. So that's something we really need to think about because that's getting serious. It's not just a few things that are in inconvenient. That's an entire, the entire political energies of the country doing something of considerable significance that most people who think about it think is an extremely silly thing to do. That's the position that we're in, that's the position that our democracy has got to. So I want to say a bit about what's driving this and then I want to say remarkably enough, because I'm more used to saying, look, we've got difficult problems and there aren't any easy answers.

Nicholas Bruin ([09:30](#)):

I think there are, there is an easy answer and we'll get to that. So I want to suggest to you that political culture is suffering from something which we can see all around us in other areas, when we were on the African Savanna, our instincts, our makeup, our even the makeup that evolution gave us was a very powerful set of tools for helping us stay healthy and strong stopping helping us stop lions ITAs. And our instincts told us that sweet food was good, that things that smell in certain ways were disgusting. We shouldn't eat them that fat was energy rich and something good for us. And that was pretty good. That was a pretty good set of instincts. But when you optimize that in a competitive market for a few hundred years, that's what you get and that's killing us and something quite similar as happy funding in politics.

Nicholas Bruin ([10:52](#)):

So emotions hold society together. We make decisions using emotions, which people, lot of people don't know. But there've been very various people when you find these signs of kind of freaky things out with brain injuries and a man of considerable intelligence had a part of his brain damaged, which, which control the emotions. And he remained as intelligent as he, as he had ever been in fact more so and was unable to make decisions about when he would have lunch and when he would stand up and any of that stuff. So emotions help us make decisions and they bind us together. They make it possible for us to arrive at collective intentions no primates, other than us have anything like the degree of capacity for collective intention primates, don't pull a tree down, of a tree down. So another primate can get hold of the fruit and emotions kind of do that.

Nicholas Bruin ([12:02](#)):

And there's a quote from political philosopher and economist. He was Austrian finance minister briefly called Joseph Schumpeter. And this is from his book in 1943 and incredibly powerful book with two chapters. It's called capitalism, socialism, and democracy with two chapters in it on democracy. And they really once I read them, I was pretty impressed because there they have a sort of an architectural logic to them. They just present you with a simple fact, and here's Sean Pater as early as 1943 reflecting on the role of the emotions, the eyes, reflecting on the idea that political behavior is an effective not reasoning, not cognitive. There is no reason for you to vote if you are going to advantage yourself because you have an infinitesimal chance of changing the result, but it's a good thing. So this is a way in which the emotions bind us together. Cause it gets, gets out in this country, including a fine 90 or so percent of the population to vote. And in other countries about 60 or so percent of the vote doing something that isn't in their immediate interests. Sean Peter is also thinking of course of Al Hitler at that point, I presume who said, I use emotions for the many and reason for the few.

Nicholas Bruin ([13:37](#)):

So if emotions hold us together, reflect on what emotions have been dominant in our culture. What emotions are becoming more dominant in our culture? Who knows, who said that? Well, that was said on the day that the events happened that became the disgraceful scandal of children overboard. And those words were said by that man, and they were hushed up. But you can see the emotions that, that expression appeals to. And you remember these words and they're about the same event. And one type of emotion is an emotion which turns inward and binds up wounds. And it is the emotion of care. I've given it a color, a little like the suffragettes. If you are, we can say these things now it's not the 1970s, but it is a feminine emotion. And that doesn't mean that all women have it and no men do, but it's part of one part of our makeup and this is a different kind of thing. And that's the thing that is dominating. So

these in this environment, what happens is we have a large region things that are kind of no goes zones because they allow, they allow, if you take one of these topics up, they allow your opponents to misrepresent you, to attack you, to scare people, to come up with a zinger. And that's the end of the issue. And you have to tip toe around them, go into talking points mode, and pretend that you've done stuff that you haven't and all the rest of it.

Nicholas Bruin ([15:45](#)):

And if you did anything about the last point, which is that the media has absolutely freedom to be as irresponsible as it likes, that's what you're going to look forward to. So again, we're in a bad situation. Not that I'm any great fan of Stephen Conrad, but he's okay. He's certainly not Joseph Stalin or any of those other people. So what can we do now that this has turned pretty seriously toxic for our society? Well, let's go back to Athens. Isn't that a beautiful picture? What the hell did they think they were doing? Building that building so big, so expensive. It took 10% of the gross domestic product of Athens over about two or three decades, 190 tons of silver anyway, that's another matter. So that was a small place with fewer citizens than all three with donga. And we have in our minds that it was run by participatory democracy, but most of it, well, it's not, most of it was run by something else.

Nicholas Bruin ([17:05](#)):

And before I get onto that, this is again, my friend Joseph Schumpeter with his other great architectural idea, which is that any any human formation of any significance requires a cognitive division of labor. It doesn't put it quite like that there, but that's what that's about. Ladies and gentlemen, democracy is mostly boring. It's about attaining to little details and nobody wants to, and the things had that problem and we solve that. So we have participant the Athenians managed to have participatory democracy as the highest authority. We could do the same thing. Ababa did that. And if you think that's a good idea, the policy Brian's still mean just feel free. But beyond that, you need to develop a cognitive division of labor and you want it to be a democratic cognitive division of labor. And I think there are two ways to do that.

Nicholas Bruin ([18:18](#)):

And the one with of me with is by-election and that's been popular since around about the French revolution. In other words, not for that long, surprisingly enough. Our parliament, our whole political system is built on it. Par party parties aggregate, but two platforms. And the alternative is by sortition choosing people by lot. And there was a lot to do in Athens, a lot of government functions to run the army things that passed for hospitals, schools, garbage collection healing looking after pensions, things like that. And what they had is they had the bullae, which was a council of 500 people chosen at random 50 from each of the 10 tribes rotated every year. And that did most of the work and this survived through Rome and into European cities through the through the middle ages.

Nicholas Bruin ([19:27](#)):

And of course is alive and well in juries in our law courts. The, I just want to introduce you to a word that I, that blew me away is Segovia, which is the, which is sometimes translated as freedom of speech. It means equality of speech, and we have very little equality of speech in our parliament, which is one of the things that Pauline Hanson is pretty upset about. Certain kinds of speech are not, are treated as abominable. Now you many people might think that's a good thing. Body fits if it's a reasonable proportion of your population, I'm not sure that it is. So here is the citizen. Here's the jury we know of citizens' juries. Let me take you through some of our experiences with citizens, juries, because taxi the

Australian center for social innovation for social innovation has run a number of citizens, juries, and this was one of them.

Nicholas Bruin ([20:28](#)):

And I'll go through this fairly quickly. Overwhelmingly jurors were extremely positive about their experience. I'll give you some examples composition of jury didn't match expectations, not just the young activists. That's one of the things that people hate about politics. I was expecting the blue rinse set from the Eastern. I was delighted to find that wasn't the case. I'm a man I'm six foot two. I have no considerations for my safety in Adelaide. Then being with other people, older, smaller females, you learn that their experiences are very different. Do people have that experience on the media while in a sense, yes, but through a shouting match through an identity challenge of I'm this sort of person, and these are those sorts of people and we hope, hate those other sources. So, so this is the sort of, these are the sorts of instincts that are starting that start to get cultivated in a citizens jury.

Nicholas Bruin ([21:27](#)):

The feeling that self-selected the feeling that self-selection demonstrated, commitment, having choice and control support inside and outside the sessions, the sense of occasion, he's a couple of quotes on that. And so people, I mean, that's a, this is how people feel, but it's also outsiders say how, how much, how much more people know how much better they know they are doing this than they expect that they might be changed jurors perceptions many thought differently about the challenge of democratic decision-making making reduced in Susan, more empathy towards others. There was one group I see. So their opinion of others goes up with one exception, not what it is. And so if it's the right yes, the media and, and they discover, they say things like, well, we've just been lied to about this issue, which isn't quite true.

Nicholas Bruin ([22:35](#)):

They'd been entertained in the lowest cost way by getting everyone raved up. And they were annoyed, angry and appalled when they saw their own deliberations covered in the media. You only have to have a bit of firsthand experience to this, to, to sort of toughen up about a very considerable and so on we go, the government government officials of jurors, all the jurors in the room had a real sense of responsibility. They were very impressed with them. So this balance of emotion goes the other way. This balance of emotion brings out that side of our makeup, which is the side of our makeup. One might've thought was the one that we want to bring out in our politics, as important as the other side of our makeup can be from time to time. So one other quick point, the Oregon citizens review initiative.

Nicholas Bruin ([23:35](#)):

So Oregon has citizen initiated referendums as Switzerland does. And people in Oregon got concerned at how easily these were being manipulated by vested interests. And they got a position that they got us structure in place where as part of the constitutional arrangements, any citizens initiated referendum is deliberated upon by a citizens jury of 24. People chosen by lot who then produced short advice to the community about about what they telling them what they should do to vote their vote for both the, for case and against case are constructed by jurors in four, in 300 words. And on the piece of paper that you get as you vote in fact, in a pack that is sent to you you also told how people thought, well, how many of the 24 voted for yes. And how many of the 24 voted for no measure?

Nicholas Bruin ([24:35](#)):

73 is a classic piece of Vox pop democracy, mandatory sentencing. So these were two puzzles. One was that someone who had been convicted four times of a felony sex offense be mandatorily detained for 25 years. And someone who had committed a driving under the influence three times had a mandatory sentence of 90 days in each case being told those simple facts doesn't sound too bad to me. In any event, the population of Oregon was 70% in favor of that proposal. And the jury sat and 21 of 24 people said it was a lousy proposal and they were going to vote against it. After thinking about it, reading about it, finding out what a felony sex offense for instance was, cause I'm sure there were some fair felony sex offenses, which if you committed them four times, it wouldn't be the right thing to put you in jail for 25 years.

Nicholas Bruin ([25:45](#)):

So that's a pretty remarkable result. The sting in the tail is that okay, it brought the vote down from 57% to 43%. So it, it was influential. So it shows that this way of doing things could be important for us, but if we don't do more with it, it will lose out to those red emotions. So my suggestion, I have I want to disrupt the status quo. It's time to not just say how nice these things are and have them all very advisory. I want to do something a lot more than that. Now how's this for a picture. I'm going to give you, I'm going to tell you just a little bit about this, this wonderful son that we're heading towards, but you know, this is my preferred constitution for Australia, but who am I? So I'll also say a little bit about a pathway that might, we might help us get there.

Nicholas Bruin ([26:42](#)):

So I want a peoples chamber. I want the 21st century to be about the relationship between the upper house and the lower house just as the 19th century was in the 19th century. The big debate was how do we organize checks and balances between a house that represents the people and a house that represents property. And we had various rules about you know, in different places like the United States. If you've got a super majority, you can do this and you can overrule the president. And here in legislative councils, we had various other rules in the federal constitution. We have section 57 where there's a deadlock between the Senate and the house. I want there to be a lower house, which is just the way it is and an upper house, which is the S w which is representation by sortition.

Nicholas Bruin ([27:37](#)):

I don't mind if it's a third chamber cause the Senate does a pretty good job as well. And but, but that's essentially what I'm heading towards. And that's all very well, isn't it? Who am I, nobody. But if we can get these ideas out, maybe we can go somewhere with them cause we're in a fairly serious situation. But the thing is the thing is that this very method could be politically efficacious to the point of being explosive. What I'm talking about is we can do this for ourselves if we sorry. That's roughly so yeah, sorry. I'll, I'll tell a little bit more about my ideal constitution, cause I've got a very sneaky part of it and I want you all to hear what it is. Firstly, the, a simple majority of the upper house gets a delaying power. Like the house of Lords has, that's saying, look, you guys don't have a lot of political power, but you have enough power to be taken seriously. You can get in the way of people, but if you can get a super majority of the upper house, think of the examples I've given you think of carbon pricing, your first port of call to break the deadlock is to impose upon the other house or houses, a secret balance.

Nicholas Bruin ([29:08](#)):

And that would've got carbon pricing off the table. I confidently predict in 1974, they actually do have secret ballots in the house and the Senate. They have it for the speaker, which I was used to explain why

we didn't have such terrible speakers, but we've had one or two since then. And in 1974, Justin O'Byrne won the won the presidency of the Senate, even though there were more liberal country party senators that cause snuck across the floor, undetected and voted for Justin. I burn. So we, and so we, this is the sort of thing which I think could easily break deadlocks. So the first step would be to compel a secret ballot and the second would be to break the deadlock with a joint city. Finally, then the path what I'm saying to you is that if we can do this kind of thing ourselves, it makes for an explosive political spectacle.

Nicholas Bruin ([30:10](#)):

If we could get a decent amount of money, I think it might be about \$10 million. Actually we could actually fund a standing citizens chamber and it would be very interesting and a magnet to the media to find out how that chamber worked its way through the parliamentary notice paper and water thought of different measures. And you would get an immediate litmus test of when Vox pop democracy was taking us away from the considered views of the population and that's expensive, but a temporary chamber for an election season ought to be doable. And a few people I've even spoke to some, a person, quite a prominent campaign manager in the United States who really likes this idea. We didn't have enough time to do it for this election, but as you know, philanthropists grow on trees in the United States. And I think that's possible. So that is my suggestion for for what we do. And if anyone's interested in a much longer disquisition on this, I thought I had an hour and I wrote out a long speech. And even if it was going to be too long to give you today, but you can it's H L I R M U S on tiny your.url.com. Anyway, that's what I have to say. And I'm very happy to take any questions.

Tom Richardson ([31:41](#)):

Thanks very much, Nicholas. And as, as he said to him, we do have a short period of time. I'm held to a very tight time constraint, but we have probably 10 minutes. And I'd ask you to make your way to the microphone

Nicholas Bruin ([31:57](#)):

And form an orderly

Tom Richardson ([31:58](#)):

Queue, no statements I've been told to

Nicholas Bruin ([32:02](#)):

Make very clear and adjust

Speaker 3 ([32:04](#)):

That my name is Kate woops, and I'm on the citizens jury. I could speak for hours about my concerns about the citizens, jury, the content and the process, but I won't

Nicholas Bruin ([32:18](#)):

Just, is this the citizens jury on nuclear power? Yes.

Speaker 3 ([32:22](#)):

So I just I have a very short question, but this is a little extra, you have mentioned in your promotion of citizen juries, that they have reported that their cynicism and their annoyance is that the media. And I can say that in my experience, I haven't heard one word against the jewelry and the main annoyance has been actually at the government and the way that our question has been framed, we have a very, in my and many other people's opinion, a devious question to answer, which I'd love to tell you, however,

Nicholas Bruin ([33:01](#)):

Oh, you can't tell us. Oh, no, no. I just don't want to go off on a long discussion about this particular one, but you just, just go with

Speaker 3 ([33:12](#)):

What the devious question. Oh, well I

Nicholas Bruin ([33:13](#)):

Just thought it wasn't, it's not secret or anything. No,

Speaker 3 ([33:15](#)):

No, that's fine. Okay. Under what circumstances, if any, should south Australia pursue the opportunity to store and dispose of nuclear waste from other countries? This question actually to me, well, it's got, it's got a yes and a no, and a maybe with caution and the premier explained it to us in the first session. It's a red and Amber and the green, but my quest, my, my point is to ask you what you, your in your ideal situation of a jury who would frame the question because after 11 days, we were actually told after 11 days that the premiere and the premiers department had had a hand in framing the question, which many of us had suspected from the start?

Nicholas Bruin ([34:05](#)):

Hmm. Well, my it's a good question. I, I, I guess I, I, when I listen to that question, it doesn't sound too devious to me, but I agree. I thought it was gonna, I thought what you were going to say would sound devious to me and I would say yes, that sounds devious. And what do you think if the whole thing was a set up by box pop democracy at the moment we have citizens' juries as a nice exercise, almost invariably sanctioned by the existing system. And it will therefore be used to achieve certain things. My view about the way, the sort of thing I'm talking about should work is that it should be as the house of representatives is its own sovereign body decides what it wants to do. And the citizens chamber would decide what it wanted to do. And if you wanted to answer the question that you personally are unhappy with all the Amber red and green lights, you just should go right ahead because no one can stop you. If the premiers department tells you, you're not allowed to do it, tell the premiers department you are yeah, Mark Hudson I'm.

Speaker 4 ([35:34](#)):

What you've set up is here's the state on one side and it's perhaps captured by vested interests, perhaps there's problems with the politics of it, the political parties of it. And your solution seems to be individuals coming together either momentarily or for a prolonged period. What's missing seems to be intermediate organizations that aren't directly focused at the state. So I'm thinking tray, I mean, good old fashioned social democracy that we had until Hawke Keating, basically. Well, well, but there's very thing. Very interesting thing that happened in the late eighties was we had the ecologically sustainable

development process, which I'm sure you sure you remember. And that was going to be, you know, to use the language here, the open state, the responsive state, we would tackle this big problem. And it wasn't John Howard that killed off Australian climate policy. It was Paul Keating and the bureaucrats within the federal government. So what's to stop your, I suppose. So finally at the end of my rant, what's to stop your third chamber, simply getting controlled by vested interests and ignored when it doesn't do what Rupert Murdoch once

Nicholas Bruin ([36:51](#)):

Explain how it gets captured by vesting. Well,

Speaker 4 ([36:54](#)):

I'm conscious that other people probably want to have a okay, well,

Nicholas Bruin ([36:58](#)):

So let me, let me give you my rent, which is that, it's an interesting question. How is it that a majority that all of the liberal parliamentarians voted again, that a majority of liberal parliamentarians voted against their conscience on climate change? That's the reason it's simple careerism and, and I'm not being moralistic or negative about that. Every successful politician is a career politician. Abraham Lincoln was a career as a politician. You don't get to do worthwhile things in politics by being a goody-goody, you get it by mixing up ends and means and so on. So I say that with respect to those politicians that is one of the things that you simply chop off with choice by lot, because you cannot make a career of your presence of your presence in the chamber. It doesn't lead to another appointment. So I mean, there's more to be said you could bribe people and you would obviously pass legislation to try and stop that. That would be a little bit of that, but our experience with our experience with jurors, citizens, jurors is that people getting bought is very rare, but I don't want to, you know, we're human fallible creatures, and there'll be a bit of that going on probably time for one, maybe two more. Unfortunately, Mr. Jacobs is known for his brevity.

Nicholas Bruin ([38:25](#)):

Mr. Richardson,

Speaker 5 ([38:27](#)):

Can I take you back to the point that was made about citizen juries outrage at the way their proceedings or their outcomes were reported by the mass media justifiable outrage because of the increasing tendency to report everything as a kickboxing match. Do you agree with Phillip Adams that their salvation lies in a future in which broadcasting, not just radio, but large institutions to mass audiences is dead and narrow casting will be the future. Consequently, since Philip the capacity of large media institutions to debase complex issues will be diminished.

Nicholas Bruin ([39:13](#)):

Well, we're quite aware entirely up to debating it ourselves, go look at Facebook, go look at the blogosphere, go and write a newspaper column as I haven't looked at the comments. So we have an instinct for debasing it, and we have to build an institutional environment where our instincts where the, the right kind of emotions or the emotions that are constructive in that environment. Given rain

and somehow in these environments, the things go, you know, pretty at the very least in a, in an unhelpful direction, but actually in a toxic direction

Speaker 3 ([39:55](#)):

Politicians, existing politicians, and particularly the political parties would clearly not favor such an institution as you are proposing. So I wonder about the process that you are envisaging under, which we could get to the point, the path to the outcome, which

Nicholas Bruin ([40:18](#)):

I would support. Yeah. Yeah. So I think we just have to use a bit of imagination. It's true that if you're a policy, I've actually tried this you know, a state premier who I know quite well, who will remain nameless, but might in this state be difficult for me to keep him nameless and and leading politicians of both parties at the federal level. And if I was them, I know that I've as a politician, I'd just be thinking, oh God, not a, no, the thing I've got to worry about, not another constraint. So as with a number of other ideas of mine, that I've peddled in economics, you have to work out how, what you're suggesting could be useful to them. And I think the Australian labor party could have had a very could have funded, okay, by an externally organized citizens' jury on climate change or sit or carbon pricing, then we get the question of budget questions and so on.

Nicholas Bruin ([41:25](#)):

I mean, it would be a [inaudible] process, but so long as the process of selection is not manipulated in the Australian, people have confidence in the selection process. There's a lot of integrity to it. So I think there are all sorts of ways that the idea of citizens assemblies, citizens, chambers could be used in creative ways by politicians of all hues in their own special areas. And that starts to legitimize the, the, the idea. And I would say further that there are some broadly speaking politicians on the left, who I hope, continue to think that they are part of a politics of liberation. And my pitch to them has been that you, you are trying to attract to yourself small amounts of power, think of the trade union movement. And a question came up, which intimated that earlier. They have some power and I've argued to them at their national Congress that they should fund some citizens' juries.

Nicholas Bruin ([42:32](#)):

Well, they have a little bit of power and they want to hang on to that bit of power. But if they're part of the politics of liberation, they would get a lot more power as the British monarchy did when it gave away some power and the glorious revolution and said, we will be subject to the law of the land. People can Sue us if we don't pay the money back and they could borrow from the whole of Europe because people knew they could get their money back. In other words, that might sound like a flight of logic to you. But what I'm saying is that if you think of yourselves as a politics of, of human betterment and liberation, there will be times when by giving away a little bit of power, you can gain so much more for you. I must try that. I have to wrap it up there.

Speaker 3 ([43:18](#)):

I must try that with my neighbor [inaudible]

Nicholas Bruin ([43:25](#)):

Things, and you need to try and get a certain part of his makeup dominant over another part of his makeup. That's where we're all like that. Thanks.

Tom Richardson ([43:37](#)):

Ladies and gentleman, thank you for coming. And thank, I guess, making the screw up. We're a very thought provoking lecture as a media representative. I did feel a little bit in the doc on my own here in the front row, but no, thanks for a very thought provoking lecture and just a couple of other housekeeping matters to attend to for those sticking around for the day. Please note, unfortunately, Indy Johar has had to cancel today's session. Instead I'm told Tim Dunlop is now speaking at the, at the open state hub here outside the museum at 4:00 PM instead of the initial time at the head at five 15. So I reshuffle to today's show schedule. Can I also remind you all that there is a festival marquee over here with a cafe, a delicious food, and I pop up in prince book sellers on the lawns outside of elder hall. You can also stay updated with all things associated with the festival of ideas by signing up to the electronic newsletter via the website. Please leave feedback. There are surveys available from the festival volunteers and at the marquee. And finally could I remind you that the festival is a non-profit event? There are volunteers wandering around rummaging rattling buckets in tins, and we'll gladly accept any donation you would care to give, to keep the festival operating. Thank you very much. And thanks.